1/ 28/70

Dear Paul,

I had expected the Joyner report to relate to Joiner, with an error.

I believe I called to your attention Hosty's interest in him, from the DPD files. I have made no effort to check him with the ADL, which had an agent inside the Nazis. Do you think it worthwhile? Offhand, I do not. Is it correct to consider this both CD 87 and CD 516, or do you think the 516 represents something else?Not just this SS number?

Itake it your "Quiroga letter" is the one asking for CD75:705-6. He complained the feds had no interest in having him as a stoolpidgeon "inside" Oswald. I can conceive of but a single reason for this: they knew it would serve no purpose. They trucked with a rather wierd assortment of Cubans. He is one of the more respectable, a professional (which might be said of Bringuier).

May I also remind you of my Vinson correspondence, of which you have a copy, and his promise to me of two years ago that they were reviewing the Ferrie documents? If we can get this su t going before May, I venture to suggest a few added docs will be shaken loose. He fails to say whose review. If it is the Arch, they take the position they have no authority to override FBI. Thus, meaninglessness in his conclusion.

I have accepted tour suggestion on Mary and the translation.

Your mathematical answer to my uestions what are the odds to two separate people writing the same five numbers in the same sequence is impressive and at the same time bewildering. It is not alone that the same numbers be used, but they must also be in the same sequence. There is also a fascinating coincidence to me, these are the same digits that repeat themselves in a different sequence and another context, one in which I have great interest for AGENT OSWALD.

Whether you put it past JG or not, and I cannot blame you for being suspicious, they didn't. Had they, they'd have used it with telling effect in court. They didn't even check it until too late. They were caught flatfooted and got clobbered when they could have scored points.

Mankiewicz: I never saw the TMC letter and would appreciate a copy, please. Clear xerox, for possible use in appendix notes in COUP-fairness to M.

Added comment on Brener: he failed to use quotes around his different spellings if he quoted all of them. I recall, perhaps incompletely, but one quoted.

Fourth class educational: I believe what is sent a publisher is covered, and I am such. Also manuscripts, and if a book is not a book, what can it beother than a ms?

Please tell me what you mean by "Navy related files", other than ONI and CAI. I will do, but how will I know what you already have? Like Folsom.

Dist my books: Nix on John. Bud doesn't want, having read, I see no reason for Olson to have since it cannot likely produce constructive ends. Sylvia no, for she has read. If she asks, refer to me, for she has interposed her judgement over mine in telling what I told her not to and it came back to me when that one blabbed. I reserve the right to decide for myself who I shall trust and I refuse to impart trust in those who have amply earned mistrust simply because Sylvia has her own ideas, based upon no knowledge. She is brilliant, has done wonderful things, often has better judgement than I (like with Schiller), but with young men she has a thing (as with Epstein). Within two weeks of my telling her something I told her I wanted to go no further about someone and my reasons for not doing something, it had come back to me. She and I alsone were present. You may regard this as paranoid or juvenile, I do as unpleasant, but I have had experiences you have not (generally and specifically). But in any event, I loaned her these books and she has read them.

Before going further, there is another thing I believe I have never told you. I never talk about it. But I am also under threats, some of them quite polished, really professional. If you consider some of the areas into which I have gone, some of the people I have made very unhappy, as none of the rest of us have, and recall that I live in isolation, and that sometimes my wife is alone, I think you may be able to understand another aspect of my not wanting what I am doing bruited about until it is done, when it can be a kind of protection. If you are ever here, as I hope some day you will be, remind me to play you my "Shane" tape, a threat at 2:30 a.m. and at a time when I was making no appearances, just working on COUP. That one had the sound track of Shane to play to me over the phone, cued in to the right spots. I'm not Mark- I don't make these things up and you must have heard how I've passed them off when I've been asked. That is not because there have not been such threats. And I live in Wallace country, where the NSRP is active, with a chpater 15-20 minutes away.

On most taings, Sylvia is not at all like this. For exemple, after she gave Thornley money and wrote what she did about that rotten specimen, I offered to tell her what my interest is if she would promise not to make any mention of it to anyone, especially KT and DL. She didn't make the promise and I didn't tell her. This is honorable, but tragic, for she should not be mixed up in such filth. On even the limited basis of his indictment and for all his incompetence, JG should convict KT, for (and this was not my interest) he did known LHO was then in NO and did act on that basis.

I must have filed one of my two 1/16 letters by subject rather than under yiur name, so I do not know what I meant by card file. However, too late I did start a card file of the docs I have. Sometimes I ~~skip~~ slip up and forget to post them. Is it possible I was referring to my cards on CD75? Or could it have been a form in which I could conveniently carry data to Archives? Sorry, I just do not recall. There is little likelihood that Moo will be interested in anything not related to Shaw (despite JG's speech and the Sahl interview). He has been very explicit with me. I ma having trouble getting him to do anything where I think it is related ifit is not, as he put it, as simple as 2 plus 2. He rules out 1 plus 1 plus 2 as too complicated for their purposes. No added comment needed. And while a Ferrie-Oswald connection may not be part of what they are trying to prove, it has the greatest significance in other ways, as if they prove a Shaw-Ferrie connection. Or a Shaw-Oswald.

Your belief that deB had his own reasons for withholding and stipulated what would be withheld makes good sense. But once we have the names on the withheld pages, I may know some and may be able to get a rundown on others. If they are publicly knows as homos, this disappears as a reason. And need I add that where it was desired, such data was not withheld? The Texas file is full of it, as are WC files and exs.

The Archives has resolutelt refused to give me a list of the Ferrie docs for motnhs. You should have the correspondence, both ways. They just do not answer.

I did misread you on the basis of yoyr request based on the Bringuier book.

If you have no current need for it, can we make a swap? I'm getting one, on order, which I'd send in exchange for it. If it doesn't come or I cannot get, I'll repay you so you can get out there. Not on sale here, which is fine.

It is so long since I skimmed through CD75, having depended upon Tom for that and so much else, but my recollection of its greater disorganization is similar to yours, with this exception, I seem to recall disorganized hunks more than individual documents.

Separate comment on Albe.

Best

On BM: all I now need is a single copy of the first book. It is for this a medical man has made that offer, with assurances, etc. That I just cannot refuse in my present circumstances.